

## REMARKS

Claims 1-39 remain in the application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance.

## The § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,398 to Parthasarathy et al. (hereinafter “Parthasarathy”).

## The Claims

**Claim 1** recites a method of processing a multi-media editing project comprising:

- generating a request for one or more multi-media files for use in a multi-media editing project, the request being generated by a user computer that comprises part of a network where multi-media files are maintained in a network-accessible location;
- intercepting the request;
- ascertaining whether a requested multi-media file is located on the user computer *by checking one or more user-designated directories for the multi-media file*;
- retrieving the multi-media file if the file is located on the user computer; and
- seeking the requested file from the network-accessible location if the multi-media file is not located on the user computer.

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its  
2 subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. In support of its argument,  
3 the Office cites to Parthasarathy column 9, lines 32 through 53 which is  
4 reproduced below [emphasis added]:

5 Downloaded software components are *automatically verified* 72 by  
6 *checking a digital signature and a digital certificate contained*  
*within the software components* (e.g., with WinVerifyTrust).  
7 However, security measures other than digital signatures and digital  
8 certificates could also be used to verify a software component. In  
9 another embodiment of the present invention, the software  
10 verification step 72 is optional. For example, on a corporate  
11 intranet, where all software components behind a corporate firewall  
12 are automatically trusted and need no verification. The verified  
13 software components are then automatically installed 74 (e.g., with  
14 ICodeInstall) in various directories of a file system on the local  
15 computer 34. After installation the software components are  
16 registered 76 (e.g., with DllRegisterServer or ModuleUsage) in a  
17 registry database on the local computer 34. *The registry database is*  
*used to keep track of which software components are installed on*  
*the local computer* 34. In another embodiment of the present  
18 invention, the registration step 76 is optional. After registration,  
19 selected software components are returned 78 to a requesting  
20 application. Further details of method 66 will be explained below  
21

22 Specifically, the Office argues that this excerpt teaches a method of  
23 maintaining a registry database, which is checked (before the internet is  
24 checked) when a file is requested. The Office reasons that since there is  
25 no limitation on how the directories are designated by the user,  
Parthasarathy meets the scope of this claim language, which states:  
"checking one or more user-designated directories for the multi-media  
file".

1      Applicant is unclear about what the Office equates with "user-  
2      designated directories" as recited in this claim. Applicant has reviewed the  
3      excerpt and is unable to find where user-designated directories is  
4      mentioned at all. Further, this excerpt does not appear to disclose or  
5      suggest checking one or more user-designated directories. Rather, it  
6      appears to describe a method of *automatically verifying software* by  
7      checking digital signatures and digital certificates. In addition, another  
8      embodiment where the software verification step is optional is discussed.  
9      In this embodiment, *a registry database is apparently used to keep track*  
10     *of which software components are installed* on a local computer.

11     In contrast, this claim recites checking one or more *user-designated*  
12     *directories* for a requested multi-media file. One example of how this can  
13     be done is described in the specification starting on page 53 at line 9. This  
14     excerpt is reproduced below for the convenience of the Office [emphasis  
15     added]:

16  
17     Step 4100 generates a request for a network-  
18     maintained multi-media file. This request is ordinarily  
19     generated by a multi-media editing application executing on  
20     a user computer, such as any one of computers 4006-4010  
21     (Fig. 40). Step 4102 intercepts the request locally. Step  
22     4104 then ascertains whether the file or files referenced in  
23     the request exist. Step 4106 determines one or more local  
24     directories where multi-media files are, or have been  
25     maintained. Specifically, as a user retrieves and uses multi-  
      media files, they can store them locally. When they store  
      them locally, they typically have certain *designated*  
      *directories* that contain the files, e.g.  
      "C:/myfile/multimedia\_files". Alternately, they might store  
      the files anywhere on their hard drive. *A user can then*  
      *designate appropriate directories as directories that contain*  
      *multi-media files*. One example of when a user can do this

1 is given below. Thus, when a request is intercepted, as in  
2 step 4102, the software can quickly ascertain the directories  
3 of interest (e.g. *the directories that have been designated by*  
4 *a user as containing multi-media files*) that are likely to  
5 contain the multi-media files. Step 4108 then checks the  
6 *determined local directories* for the requested multi-media  
7 file. This step is advantageous in that it can avoid checking  
8 all of the directories of a hard drive which can be time  
9 consuming. If the file is found locally (step 4110), then the  
10 file is retrieved from its local location and used (step 4112).  
11 If, on the other hand, the file is not found locally, step 4114  
12 asks *the user to point to a local directory* where the multi-  
13 media file might be stored. Step 4116 then checks the user-  
14 designated directory and if the multi-media file is found, step  
15 4112 retrieves and uses the file. If, on the other hand, step  
16 4116 does not find the file in the local *directory designated*  
17 *by the user*, step 4118 checks appropriate network  
18 directories for the requested multi-media file. This step can  
19 be implemented by sending on the request that was  
20 intercepted at step 4102. It will be appreciated and  
21 understood that *once a user designates a new local directory*  
22 *(i.e. responsive to step 4114) that contains one multi-media*  
23 *file*, the software will remember this directory and will  
24 automatically check it when multi-media files are requested  
25 in the future.

16 Applicant does not understand the Office's reasoning that there is  
17 no limitation on how the directories are designated by the user. The fact  
18 that there is no limitation on how the directories are designated by the user  
19 does not appear to be germane because Parthasarathy does not appear to  
20 teach or disclose checking one or more *user-designated directories*.  
21 Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is not anticipated by this  
22 reference and is allowable.

23 **Claims 2-11** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending  
24 from an allowable base claim.

1           **Claim 12** recites a method of processing a multi-media editing  
2 project comprising:

3

- 4           • maintaining information on a local computer that comprises  
5           part of a network having multiple computers, said  
6           information being associated with multi-media files that are  
7           maintained in a network-accessible location and that can be  
8           temporarily stored on the local computer's hard drive; and
- 9           • responsive to a request to retrieve a multi-media file from the  
10           network-accessible location, using the information to attempt  
11           to locate the requested file on the local computer's hard drive  
12           *in one or more user-designated directories* before  
13           attempting to retrieve the file in the network-accessible  
14           location.

15

16           In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its  
17           subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above,  
18           Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-  
19           designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not  
20           anticipated and is allowable.

21

22           **Claims 13-18** depend from claim 12 and are allowable as  
23           depending from an allowable base claim.

24

25           **Claim 19** recites one or more computer-readable media having  
26           computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a  
27           computer, cause the computer to:

28

- 29           • maintain a list on a local computer that comprises part of a  
30           network having multiple computers, said list being used to  
31           determine which local *user-designated directories* have been  
32           used in the past, or are currently being used to stored multi-  
33           media files that are maintained in a network-accessible  
34           location; and

1           • responsive to a request to retrieve a multi-media file from the  
2           network-accessible location, use the list to first attempt to  
3           locate the requested file on the local computer's hard drive.

4           In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its  
5           subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above,  
6           Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-  
7           designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not  
8           anticipated and is allowable. Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is  
9           allowable

10           Claims 20-24 depend from claim 19 and are allowable as  
11           depending from an allowable base claim.

12           Claim 25 recites a method of processing a multi-media editing  
13           project comprising:

14           • receiving one or more multi-media files from a network-  
15           accessible location;  
16           • locally storing the one or more multi-media files in a local  
17           *user-designated directory* on a user computer for use in a  
18           multi-media editing project;  
19           • updating a list of local *user-designated directories* that  
20           contain or have contained multi-media files in the past in the  
21           event that the one or more multi-media files are stored in a  
22           local *user-designated directory* that is not contained in the  
23           list;  
24           • responsive to receiving a request for a multi-media file that  
25           is maintained in the network-accessible location;  
26           • first checking in all of the local *user-designated directories*  
27           on the list of local *user-designated directories* for the  
28           requested file; and  
29           • second checking the network-accessible location for the  
30           requested file in the event the requested file is not found  
31           locally.

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its  
2 subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above,  
3 Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-  
4 designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not  
5 anticipated and is allowable. Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is  
6 allowable

7 **Claims 26-29** depend from claim 25 and are allowable as  
8 depending from an allowable base claim.

9 **Claim 30** recites one or more computer-readable media having  
10 computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a  
11 computer, cause the computer to:

- 12 • maintain a list of local *user-designated directories* that are  
13 or have been used to store multi-media files on a local user  
14 computer, the multi-media files being accessible from a  
15 network storage location;
- 16 • generate a request for a multi-media file that is accessible  
17 from a network storage location, the request being intended  
18 for use in retrieving a multi-media file from the network  
19 accessible storage location;
- 20 • intercept the request;
- 21 • ascertain a requested file from the request;
- 22 • first, determine whether the requested file is locally available  
23 by checking all of the local *user-designated directories*  
24 maintained on the list and retrieve the requested file from a  
local *user-designated directory* if the file is locally  
maintained;
- second, seek the requested file from the network storage  
location if the file is not locally maintained;
- store the requested file in a local *user-designated directory* if  
the requested file is retrieved from the network storage  
location; and

1           • update the list to reflect the local *user-designated directory*  
2           if the local *user-designated directory* in which the requested  
3           file is stored is not on the list.

4           In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its  
5           subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above,  
6           Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-  
7           designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not  
8           anticipated and is allowable. Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is  
9           allowable.

10           **Claim 31** depends from claim 30 and is allowable as depending  
11           from an allowable base claim.

12           **Claim 32** recites a multi-media editing system comprising:

13           • a multi-media file locator object configured to intercept  
14           network-bound requests for multi-media files and determine  
15           whether requested files are locally maintained on a user  
16           computer *in one or more user-designated directories*; and  
17           • a list associated with the file locator object and referencing  
18           local *user-designated file directories* on the user computer  
19           where multi-media files are stored, the list being used by the  
20           file locator object to determine whether requested files are  
21           locally maintained on the user computer.

22           In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its  
23           subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above,  
24           Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-  
25           designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not  
          anticipated and is allowable. Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is  
          allowable.

Claims 33-39 depend from claim 32 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

## Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38,605  
(509) 324-9256